

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 22 August 2016

APPEAL DECISIONS (FOR INFORMATION)

APP/F2605/W/16/3143581: WEETING: Land between the B1106 & Angerstein Close. Appeal by Mr R Childerhouse against a refusal of planning permission for a proposed revised access to residential development of land north of Cromwell Road, Weeting.

Decision: Allowed.

Summary: The Inspector concluded that whilst the proposal would result in some adverse effects on the character and appearance of the area, this would be significant and would be outweighed by the benefits of the development in providing housing.

APP/2605/W/16/3143958: SAHAM TONEY: Land at Coburg Lane, Saham Hills. Appeal by Serruys Property Co. against a refusal to grant planning permission for a proposed development of five self-build plots and ancillary works.

Decision: Dismissed

Summary: The Inspector found that the proposed development outside the village boundary would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Access arrangements would also be substandard. For these reasons the proposal would not represent sustainable development. The housing benefits of the proposal did not outweigh the harm identified.

APP/F2605/W/16/3145874: BRADENHAM: 14 Mill Hill. Appeal by Mr John Manoukin against the refusal of planning permission for a proposed development of a new pair of semi detached dwellings.

Decision: Dismissed.

Summary: The Inspector found that the proposal for 2 dwellings in the village would result in an overdevelopment of the site, causing harm to the character and appearance of the area. The development would also unacceptably overlook neighbouring properties.

APP/F2605/W/16/3146696: LITTLE FRANSHAM: Homestead, Main Road. Appeal by Mr Christopher Stuart against a decision to refuse outline planning permission, for two properties within its curtilage.

Decision: Allowed.

Summary: Although outside a settlement boundary, the proposed development would not encroach into the countryside and would enjoy reasonable access to services. The proposal therefore represented sustainable development.

APP/F2605/W/16/3145565: ROCKLAND ALL SAINTS: White Hart Public House, 47 The Street. Appeal by Mr Adrian Annison against a decision to refuse planning permission, to erect four new bungalows with parking.

Decision: Dismissed.

Summary: The Inspector found that due to its backland nature, the proposal for 4 dwellings would be at odds with the linear form of the village and appear out of place. The harm cause to the character of the area would be significant and outweighed the benefits of the development. He disagreed that flood risk would be increased, however, reasoning that this could be managed by an appropriate drainage scheme.

APP/F2605/W/15/36138064: EAST TUDDENHAM: Site opposite Highcroft, Sandy Lane. Appeal by Mr Ken Thompson against the decision to refuse planning permission. The development proposed is described as Temporary siting of a mobile home and change of use of a storage building to a dog kennel.

Decision: Dismissed insofar as it relates to the mobile home, but allowed in respect of the dog kennel.

Summary: The Inspector concluded that an essential need for the mobile home relating to the adjacent kennels had not been established. The proposal was therefore contrary to policies which restricting housing in the countryside. Because of its utilitarian design the mobile home would also detracted from the appearance of the area. Temporary permission was granted for the kennels to allow effects on neighbours to be monitored.

APP/F2605/W/16/3147186: MATTISHALL: Thynnes Lane. Appeal by Mr Martin Booth against a decision to refuse planning permission to erect four detached dwellings, garaging and associated access.

Decision: Dismissed.

Summary: Four dwellings were proposed off a narrow country lane on the edge of Mattishall. Because of its restricted width and visibility and lack of footways, the road would not provide safe access for vehicles or pedestrians.

APP/F2605/W/16/3147955: ATTLEBOROUGH: 6 Croft Green. Appeal by Mr T Skitmore against a decision to refuse planning permission, to erect a single storey detached dwelling, form new access to 6 Croft Green and demolish garage.

Decision: Dismissed.

Summary: The Inspector found that the proposal for the proposed dwelling would detract from the spacious character of the area and appear cramped. Whilst there was a shortfall in housing land, the modest contribution of the proposal would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area.